CAITANYA'S FOLLOWERS AND THE *BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ*:

A Case Study in Bhakti and the Secular

JOSEPH T. O'CONNELL

The *Bhagavad-gītā* is a Vaiṣṇava text that has enjoyed the widest currency in India for the last two millenia. It is thus reasonable to ask how the Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas (i.e., those revering as their savior Kṛṣṇa-caitanya of Bengal) understood the *Bhagavad-gītā*. It is a bit surprising to find that not until the end of the seventeenth century, more than a century and a half after the death of Caitanya, did any Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇava produce a commentary upon the *Gītā* that is extant today.

There was available to the Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas the commentary on the *Gītā* by Śridhara Svāmin (fl. 1400), whose commentary on the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* they so much admired. But while the latter commentary receives praise and copious citation by Gauṛīyas, the former goes more or less unmentioned. Nor did the existence of Śrīdhara's respected commentary on the *Bhāgavata* dissuade several Gauṛīyas from trying their hand at comments of their own. It is said that Advaita Ācārya, a senior contemporary and highly regarded associate of Caitanya, commented upon the *Gītā*, but had he produced a formal written document of this sort it is most unlikely that his descendants and spiritual successors, otherwise jealous of their heritage from Advaita, would have let it slip into oblivion.[1]

Advaita had learned the devotional interpretation of the *Bhagavad-gītā*, it is reported, from his preceptor, Mādhavēndra Puri (the guru's guru of Caitanya). But apart from the small circle of Mādhavēndra's disciples there were few students of Sanskrit texts at Navadvīpa, the town in Bengal where Caitanya was born, who did not subordinate the teachings on devotion (*bhakti*) to the teachings on knowledge (of a gnostic and impersonal sort, *jñāna*) or on work

[1] Krishna-dāsa Kavirāja, *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, ed. Bhakti Vilās Tirtha, 5th ed. (Māyāpur, India: Caitanya Matha, G.A. 470 or A.D. 1956), 1.13:64. Hereafter cited as *CC*. Nāgendra Nāth Basu, ed., *Viśvakośa* (Calcutta, B.A. 1318 or A.D. 1911), II, 138, mentions one Sūrya-dāsa Pandita as author of a commentary on the *Gītā*, but does not indicate if he was a Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇava; standard Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇava reference books mention no such text.

(in the sense of traditional social and ritual performance, *karma*), or so one of the best of Caitanya's biographers, Vṛndāvanadāsa, laments.[2] The lament of the biographer points directly at the problem which the *Gītā* posed for the Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇavas: it does not give unambiguous enough pre-eminence to devotion over the other spiritual disciplines of knowledge and work. In particular, the *Gītā* is silent on the winsome sports of Kṛṣṇa as a child and on his amorous sports (*līlās*) as an adolescent young man, sports which the Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇavas confidently believe to reveal the essence of divine life and the perfection of religious life, loving devotion (*prema-bhakti*).[3]

Several of the biographers of Caitanya evidently were well-versed in the *Gītā*, since they quote it with some frequency. The famous six Gosvāmins of Vṛndāban, most of whom made substantial contributions to the Sanskrit literature of the Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇava movement, were aware of the *Bhagavad-gītā*, but generally were most sparing in their citation of it, according to the tables prepared by S. K. De. Only the second generation Gosvāmin, Jīva, quotes the *Gītā* with any profusion. None of the six is known to have authored a commentary upon the famous text. Of much more importance to them and to the Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇavas generally were the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and other Vaiṣṇava texts telling of the amorous pastimes of Kṛṣṇa.[4]

The first extant Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇava commentary upon the *Bhagavad-gītā* is the *Sārārtha-varṣiṇī* (also mentioned as *Sārārtha-darśinī*) of Viśvanātha Cakravartin, a brahman born in northern Bengal in the second half of the seventeenth century. Most of his copious writing in Sanskrit was done as a recluse at or near Vṛndābān. He was steeped in the distinctive Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇava literature, especially that of Rūpa Gosvāmin dealing with the mood of loving devotion (*prema-bhakti-rasa*). Even though his work appears too late to have had an impact upon the Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇavas' view of the polity and the societal community of Bengal prior to British rule, he is sufficiently typical of Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇava piety that it is worthwhile to consider briefly his treatment of the *Bhagavad-gītā*. There is another commentary on the *Gītā* by a Vaiṣṇava from Orissa said to have been a

[2] Vṛndāvana-dāsa, *Caitanya-bhāgavata*, ed. Bhakti Kevala Audulomi, 3rd ed. (Calcutta: Gauṛiya Mission, 1961), 1.2.72-73.

[3] Sushil Kumar De, *Early History of the Vaiṣnava Faith and Movement in Bengal*, 2nd ed. (Calcutta: F. K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1961); Edward C. Dimock, Jr., *The Place of the Hidden Moon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966). Both are valuable accounts of the Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇava movement.

[4] De, *Early History*, pp. 201, 220, 253, 414-15.

disciple of Viśvanātha, namely Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. I have not considered his eighteenth century document because Baladeva represents the impingement of a more philosophical attitude toward devotion, perhaps influenced by the tradition of Madhva, upon the traditionally aesthetic attitude of the Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇavas. Likewise, I have not considered the ideas of the Gauṛiya Mission and its several related revival movements in the last century, since it is the Vaiṣṇavas' stance toward public affairs from the sixteenth to the early eighteenth century, a period of Muslim domination, with which this paper is concerned.[5]

The one document after the *Bhāgavatā Purāṇa* that is the most influential among the Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇavas is the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, a Bengali biography and theological compendium completed by Kṛṣṇa-dāsa Kavirāja, the heir to the intellectual and spiritual legacy of the Gosvāmins of Vṛndābān, in the second decade of the seventeenth century. What I propose to do in this paper is to examine the ways Kṛṣṇa-dāsa and Viśvanātha respectively exegete passages from the *Bhagavad-gītā* and to relate this doctrinal information to a set of biographical data showing a high degree of involvement by Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇavas in the Muslim dominated political and administrative regime ruling Bengal in the early sixteenth century. In the examination of Kṛṣṇa-dāsa's and Viśvanātha's interpretations of the *Gītā* I shall focus upon their treatment of *karma*, traditional socio-ritual work. This is because it is in work (*karma*) that sacredness and particular forms of socio-political organization are fused. In the epic context which the *Bhagavad-gītā* portrays, the sacred normative order (*dharma*) is that characterized by the brahmanical system of castes (*varṇa*) and states in life (*āśrama*). A good king is one who enforces *varṇāśrama-dharma*; a good warrior one who risks his life in defense of it. The *Bhagavad-gītā* explicitly affirms and legitimates on sacred grounds the system of *varṇāśramadharma*, even though it has much else to say about the religious life. The Gauṛiya Vaiṣṇavas, on the contrary, tend to withdraw both legitimation and censure from the social and political spheres by confining the area of genuinely sacred activity to the interior devotional life of the individual.[6]

[5] Viśvanātha Cakravartin, *Sārārtha-varṣiṇī Tīkā* in Adhara Candra Cakravartin, ed., *Śrīmad-bhagavad-gītā* (Calcutta: Tārā Library, B.A. 1361 or A.D. 1954). Hereafter, the *Bhagavad-gītā* will be cited as *Gītā* and the *Sārārtha-varṣiṇī* as Comment on *Gītā*.

[6] For extended discussion of these issues see Joseph T. O'Connell, "Social Implications of the Gauṛiya Vaiṣnava Movement," Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard 1970.

I. *Kṛṣṇa-dāsa's Interpretation of the Gītā*

The chart appended to this article lists those verses of the *Bhagavad-gītā* which Kṛṣṇa-dāsa quotes in the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* and indicates where these occur in the editions of the Caitanya Maṭha and of Rādhā Govinda Nāth.[7] Since our present concern is the attitude Vaiṣṇavas take toward traditional patterns of action which may simultaneously have ritual and social, and often economic, political and military significances, i.e., their attitude toward performance of work (*karma*), I have simply noted the several passages which have little or no relevance to the question of work, but which speak to some other theological question. The next group includes passages which appear to be more or less favorable to the performance of work. Kṛṣṇa-dāsa's exegesis of such passages is extremely interesting and rather daring, I think. Finally, there are those passages, slightly more numerous, which seem to be unfavorable to the performance of work, passages which Kṛṣṇa-dāsa, like the Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas generally, interprets in a way favorable to devotion, but not favorable to work or knowledge (*jñāna*).

Verses indifferent to work (*karma*)

The passages from the *Bhagavad-gītā* having no direct bearing upon the issue of karma treat of the following points: God pervades and upholds the universe (*Gītā* 10:41-42); God has a spiritual nature beyond matter (*Gītā* 7:4-5); display of Kṛṣṇa's majesty (*aiśvarya*) diminishes the spontaneity of love (*Gītā* 11:41-42); fools despise Kṛṣṇa in His human form (*Gītā* 9:11); and, those who deny the supremacy of Kṛṣṇa go to perdition (*Gītā* 16:19).

Verses favorable to performance of work

Kṛṣṇa-dāsa quotes four verses from the *Gītā* early in the first book of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* to support one basic point: "If (the Lord) Himself does not perform it, *dharma*, normative order, fails to be propagated." (CC 1:3:21) The verses appealed to are: *Gītā* 4:7-8, which state that whenever dharma is in decline and its opposite in the ascendancy, the Lord incarnates Himself, in age after age for the rescue of the good, the destruction of the wicked, and the establishment of dharma; *Gītā* 3:24, which states that if He did not perform His work these worlds would perish, He would be the agent of mixing (of castes), and He would thus destroy these creatures; and, *Gītā* 3:21, which says that whatever the best do, lesser men imitate, whatever standard such a one sets, the world follows. Kṛṣṇa-dāsa goes on to say that while a mere portion of the deity, a partial *avatāra*, is capable of establishing the normative order appropriate for any particular age (*yuga-dharma*) only the Lord in person is able to distribute the love appropriate to Kṛṣṇa's pastoral village (*vraja-prema*) (CC 1:3:26). Caitanya is Kṛṣṇa in person descended for two purposes: the propagation of the dharma of the current *kali* age, propagation of the divine name (*nāmer pracāra*) (CC 1:3:40); and, the more transcending work of loving devotion (*prema-bhakti*). Kṛṣṇa-dāsa thus, like other Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas, maintains the traditional idea of a divine descent to propagate a system of normative order (*dharma*) but, by having recourse to the notion of several ages (*yuga*), radically alters the kind of dharma now valid. In place of the just war to maintain the brahmanic system of socially and ritually exclusive castes, the work required to support dharma is a combination of singing the names of God and fostering amorous devotion to Kṛṣṇa and his beloved Rādhā. Kṛṣṇa-dāsa, interestingly enough, says nothing at all about the word *saṅkaraya*, "of mixing" (castes), a problem that looms large in Kṛṣṇa's charge to Arjuna in the *Bhagavad-gītā*.

One of the verses just mentioned, *Gītā* 3:21, stating that lesser men follow the example of the best, appears again in the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* (2:17:178) not as a sanction for rigor in upholding the order of castes and states in life, as the context in the *Gītā* seems to require, but as a justification for laxity. Kṛṣṇa-dāsa appeals to this verse to explain why Caitanya, contrary to the usual practice of a brahman ascetic (*sannyāsin*), took food at the house of a brahman of questionable ritual purity. The explanation is that Caitanya simply followed the precedent of that excellent person, Mādhavēndra Puri, the guru of Caitanya's own guru, who had eaten at the same house years before.

Another passage in the *Bhagavad-gītā* (4:11) enunciates the principle that the Lord favors His devotees in ways proportionate to how they worship Him, for persons ply the road to Him in all sorts of ways. This principle can be construed broadly enough to include performance of social and ritual duties, as the *Gītā* does. However, as Kṛṣṇa-dāsa applies the verse the first time, it seems restricted to the

[7] Kṛishna-dāsa Kavirāja, *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, ed. Rādhā Govinda Nāth, 4th ed., 6 vols. (Calcutta: Sādhanā Prakāśani, n.d.).

interpersonal, devotional relationships of child to father, friend to friend, and lover to beloved. The second citing of the verse is in a special context which has little bearing on the argument of this paper. Kṛṣṇa-dāsa explains that the promise of Kṛṣṇa to respond in the proportionate or reciprocal fashion to His devotee appears to be violated in the incident in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* where married girls long to meet Kṛṣṇa but are locked in their houses. In this case, Kṛṣṇa allows them to meet Him in their meditation. Neither of these applications of *Gītā* 4:11 explicitly rules out the performance of social and ritual duties as worthwhile expressions of devotion, but neither do they give any support to such an interpretation.

A related idea appears in *Gītā* 7:16, where Kṛṣṇa states that four types of well-behaved persons worship Him: the suffering, those desiring knowledge, those seeking rewards, and those possessing knowledge. Well-behaved (*sukṛtino*) may, as Gauṛīya editors and commentators take it, refer to fidelity to the dharma of castes and states in life. Hence the mere citation of the verse constitutes a mild endorsement of the performance of karma in line with *varṇāśrama-dharma*. Kṛṣṇa-dāsa even says that the four types of well-behaved persons are most fortunate (*mahābhāgyavān*) (CC 2:14:91), but quickly adds that they should abandon the corporal and spiritual desires which motivate them and become exclusively motivated by devotion (*śuddha-bhaktimān*). He has nothing more to say in this section about being well-behaved: precisely what it involves, whether it is a *sine qua non* of further development, or a coincidental, but not essential, circumstance.

One of the foremost principles in the *Bhagavad-gītā*, especially in the early chapters in which the issue of righteous warfare in behalf of *varṇāśrama-dharma* is in focus, is that one may and should perform works which bring rewards and repercussions in this life and beyond but should dedicate all the rewards and repercussions to Kṛṣṇa. On this principle public and domestic activities can be of major religious importance. This pivotal idea is practically ignored in the more than ten thousand couplets of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*. The idea is suggested in *Gītā* 9:27, which appears once (CC 2:8:60). An intimate associate of Caitanya, Rāmānanda Rāya, is presented as reciting to Caitanya a series of scriptural statements on the goal of religious discipline. The first suggestion is that devotion comes from exercise of the dharma proper to oneself. Caitanya says that this is superficial (*bāhya*) and asks for something more. Then Rāmānanda says, "Dedication of one's works to Krishna, this is the essence of all piety," and recites *Gītā* 9:27 in support. Again, Caitanya puts the suggestion aside as superficial and the two move on toward ever more intimate modalities of loving devotion.

There is explicit mention of work in *Gītā* 6:3 (*karma*) and *Gītā* 6:4 (*karmasu*) both of which are cited by Kṛṣṇa-dāsa (CC 2:24:153-54). The first states that for one desirous of attaining *yoga*, the instrumental cause is karma; the second says that when a person no longer has attachment to the objects of sense nor to works (*karmasu*) and has abandoned all schemes he is said to have reached *yoga*. The context in the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* is a laborious exposition of the sixty-four ways Caitanya was able to construe a verse from the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (1:7:10; i.e., *ātmārāmāś ca . . .*) to show that various types of holy men authentically worship Kṛṣṇa not because of the varieties of knowledge (*jñāna*) or release (*mokṣa*) to which they are aspiring or which they have attained, but because they have grown attracted toward Kṛṣṇa by His grace, directly or by associating with devotees of Kṛṣṇa (CC 2:24:155). There is no discussion of the significance of karma in this case; it is referred to only as part of the scriptural passage cited to fill out the sixty-four-fold interpretation.

Moderation in spiritual discipline is the theme of *Gītā* 6:16-17, moderation in eating, sleeping, rest and works. Kṛṣṇa-dāsa relays these verses as part of an advice by an older ascetic, Rāmacandra Purī, to Caitanya, who had grown thin from excessive fasting. There is no consideration of moderation in domestic or public affairs on the part of householders (CC 3:8:61-67).

The eleven verses from the *Bhagavad-gītā* cited in the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* which more or less explicitly seem to endorse performance of traditional social and ritual works do not receive any comment or application by Kṛṣṇa-dāsa which would constitute an appeal for efforts to maintain or re-establish *varṇāśrama-dharma*, despite the very didactic character of the book. At most, it is admitted that exercise of one's proper dharma and dedication of one's work to Kṛṣṇa are valid but superficial types of devotion. Accidental mention of work or dharma in a few verses cited as scriptural implies that some validity attaches to such work in keeping with normative order of castes and states in life, but whether such validity is still operative, whether it is important enough to encourage are other matters. The overwhelming concern of Kṛṣṇa-dāsa is exposition of devotion to Kṛṣṇa as revealed through Caitanya. Other matters are ignored or sub-

ordinated to this one. The dharma appropriate to the present age is recitation of the names of Kṛṣṇa. The ultimate dharma surpassing all others is loving devotion to Kṛṣṇa as epitomized in His beloved Rādhā. To establish firmly both these dharmas is the purpose of Kṛṣṇa's descent as Caitanya. To save the world from the mixing of castes is the least of Caitanya's objectives, or so it would seem from a reading of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* of Kṛṣṇa-dāsa.

Verses not favorable to work

Several verses from the *Bhagavad-gītā* which state or imply that performance of work is unnecessary or baneful in the quest for devotion find their way into the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* and a few of these are cited three times, presumably reflecting the author's high regard for them as scriptural proof texts. One such text is *Gītā* 10:10, which states that the Lord gives to those who constantly and attentively worship Him with love a mental control (*buddhi-yogam*) by which they may attain to Him. This is offered as proof of a statement (CC 1:1:47) that Kṛṣṇa, by dwelling within one's soul (*antar-yāmī*) reveals Himself as a teacher. It appears again (CC 2:24:167)— in that sixty-four-fold interpretation of how saints are saved— to support the contention that devotion does not grow into love without a person's being attentive or disciplined. Later in the same exegesis (CC 2:24:186) the verse re-appears after a paraphrase of it in the Bengali text. There is no extended discussion of the verse in any of the contexts in which it is cited. While there is no overt disparagement of work in the service of dharma, there seems to be more than a hint that it is by the more direct intervention of Kṛṣṇa Himself that devotion, at least the higher loving devotion, comes to a person, rather than by work. *Gītā* 10:8, cited as CC 2:24:183, has similar import.

Another of the verses from the *Gītā* that Kṛṣṇa-dāsa cites three times is *Gītā* 7:14, which states that by resort to Kṛṣṇa one passes beyond the snares of material illusion (*māyā*), which is an aspect of Kṛṣṇa Himself. Kṛṣṇa-dāsa uses this text to support these assertions: by the mercy of Kṛṣṇa extended through holy men and scriptures souls long caught in māyā pass beyond it (CC 2:20:121); release comes not from knowledge which is without devotion, but from devotion to Kṛṣṇa (CC 2:22:23); and release from māyā is dependent upon that release which is focussed upon Kṛṣṇa (CC 2:24:131). Like the previous example this contains no explicit denigration of the

performance of works, but rather directs human attention toward awareness of Kṛṣṇa as the effective element in the process of salvation. The only extended passage from the *Gītā*, i.e., 12:13-20, carried into the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* (2:23:100-107) has much the same force. The virtues of the person who is dear to Kṛṣṇa are listed at length. They emphasize tranquilitity, indifference to changes in the external environment, and trusting devotion to Kṛṣṇa.

The next example is much the same, although the verse in the *Gītā* itself (18:54), stating that the soul which is at peace and has realized Brahman attains to the highest devotion to the Lord, seems to attribute slightly less instrumental significance to devotion than do the assertions it is called upon to support. In CC 2:8:65 it illustrates yet another of the relatively superficial types of piety, knowledge mixed with devotion (*jñāna-miśrā bhakti*), that is set aside by Caitanya in favor of unadulterated devotion. In CC 2:24:127 it supports the principle that one whose release is through devotion worships Kṛṣṇa, while one whose (alleged) release is through dry knowledge (*śuṣka-jñāne*) falls into sin (*aparādhe*). It appears a third time (CC 2:25:148) to prove that one should continuously sing the praises of Kṛṣṇa's name in order to receive release through love. In these passages there is evidence of a consistent Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇava polemic against the claims of knowledge (*jñāna*) as a means of genuine release. The parallel polemic against work (*karma*) would depict a discipline of pure work as folly, work mixed with devotion as effective but not optimally so, with pure devotion as the active ingredient in the mix. It appears in Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇava literature, but not with the frequency and urgency of the polemic against knowledge, which presumably was the greater challenge at the time.

A forceful statement of the polemic against work is CC 2:9:263:

> All scriptures advise disparagement of work (*karma-nindā*) and the abandonment of work (*karma-tyāga*). Loving devotion for Krishna never comes from work.

In support of this Kṛṣṇa-dāsa appeals to *Gītā* 18:66 wherein Krishna recommends that one forsake all dharmas and promises that He will save from all sins. The context of this is a discussion in which Caitanya is presented as criticizing the view of one Raghuvarya Tirtha that the best religious practice is dedicating to Kṛṣṇa one's dharma of caste and state in life and that the best religious attainment is enjoyment of five-fold release. *Gītā* 18:66 reappears (CC 2:22:91) to substantiate the statement:

> Forsaking all the foregoing and also the *dharma* of caste and state in life, becoming humble, one attains the sole refuge of Krishna. (CC 2:22:90)

The third occurrence of *Gītā* 18:66 is in CC 2:8:63, where it supports Rāmānanda Rāya's advocacy of abandonment of one's personal dharma as the essence of beatitude, one of the views that Caitanya sets aside as superficial.

Gītā 18:64-65 has Kṛṣṇa reveal the highest secret to Arjuna, i.e., that He is going to save Arjuna, if Arjuna remains devoted to Him, because Arjuna is dear to Him. Kṛṣṇa-dāsa writes that Kṛṣṇa gave this message through Arjuna to the whole world. Kṛṣṇa-dāsa goes on to declare:

> The former directives—for Vedic *dharma*, work, yoga, knowledge—all are terminated and the final directive is in force. If there is trust (*śraddhā*) in this directive, then one abandons all work and worships Krishna. (CC 2:22:60)

The crucial point then becomes trust in Kṛṣṇa. So long as this is wanting, there is some scope for other religious practices; when it is effectively present, only devotion to Kṛṣṇa is appropriate.

Kṛṣṇa-dāsa draws upon two verses from the *Gītā* to explain Caitanya's willingness to embrace two allegedly defiling persons, Haridāsa, the Vaiṣṇava saint of Muslim background, and Sanātana, the brahman Vaiṣṇava who was disgraced in some circles for close association with Muslims and who was diseased. *Gītā* 6:8 says that a yogi sees no difference between a clod of earth and a piece of gold; *Gītā* 5:18 says that the wise look upon cow and dog, brahman and eater of dogs as equivalent. Caitanya's behavior does not seem to have been part of an effort to do away with caste and ritual pollution altogether, as some modern enthusiasts have contended, but it was sufficiently liberal in these regards to gain for him a contemporary reputation for universal love of persons whom others would dare not touch.

The basic policy of Kṛṣṇa-dāsa in appealing to passages from the *Bhagavad-gītā* which do not favor performance of traditional social and ritual work is to argue from them to the fundamental superiority and uniqueness of devotion. Since devotion is the active ingredient in the mixtures of devotion and work and knowledge and since Kṛṣṇa by his grace bestows devotion upon whom he will, there is no basic need for work or knowledge in the ultimate religious quest.

II. *Viśvanātha Cakravartin's Commentary upon the Bhagavad-gītā*

Viśvānatha Cakravartin composed the *Sārārtha-varṣiṇi*, a commentary upon the *Bhagavad-gītā*, toward the end of the seventeenth century. His views are close to those of Kṛṣṇa-dāsa in most respects. Viśvanātha says that the first six chapters of the *Gītā* treat of the discipline of work free of desire (*niṣkāma-karma-yoga*), the middle six treat of devotion (*bhakti-yoga*), and the final six treat of knowledge (*jñāna-yoga*). Like Kṛṣṇa-dāsa, Viśvanātha considers work and knowledge to be effective at all only when mixed with some devotion. Devotion receives the central position in the *Gītā* because it is the most secret, the most respected (since it gives vitality to the other two disciplines), and because it is the most rare.* If we take the rareness (difficulty of attainment, *durlabhatvāt*) in a quantitative sense, there would be a difference of mood from Kṛṣṇa-dāsa's enthusiasm over the current ease of access to devotion, but the word may simply indicate excellence. There is a major difference between the two Vaiṣṇavas in their treatment of Caitanya and a wide divergence in concern for contemporary history. While the biographer subordinates the *Gītā* to the demands of explaining Caitanya's life and teachings in concrete historical scenes, the commentator salutes Caitanya in a couplet at the outset and thereafter ignores him and anything having to do with contemporary history.

There are a great many passages in the *Sārārtha-varṣiṇi* wherein Viśvanātha shows how one can subordinate work, and also knowledge, to devotion. I would like to focus attention upon those relatively few passages in which his comments on work give some inkling of his view of the importance of domestic and public affairs to a committed Vaiṣṇava. Two passages in the *Gītā* make explicit reference to the social implications of fighting an (apparently) unjust war (1:26-46) or failing to fight a just one (3:21-25). Viśvanātha says next to nothing in comment upon these verses, apart from grammatical or lexical notes, a fact in itself indicative of his priorities. It is interior religious discipline and not social ethics with which he is concerned. He does mention, in commenting upon *Gītā* 3:16-17, that a person who is incapable of working without desire should continue the traditional Vedic practices which nourish the gods, the ancestors and the living in the great wheel of sacred ecology.

* Comment on *Gītā* 1:1.

He also devotes seven lines of explanation to *Gītā* 3:35, which states that one should perform one's proper dharma even if badly in preference to executing another's dharma well. Viśvanātha restates Arjuna's appeal that he would rather do something less violent than the dharma of a warrior and then paraphrases the requirement stated by Kṛṣṇa. This is an explicit admission that violence in some cases is or at some time has been obligatory, but it is a perfunctory one, presumably reflecting the general Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava preference for a non-violent way of life and the practical fact that there was almost a total absence of kshatriyas among the Hindus of Bengal upon whom such an injunction could be binding. Like Kṛṣṇa-dāsa, Viśvanātha shared the conviction that the higher dharma of the current age is devoted singing of the names of God.

Viśvanātha has little else to say explicitly about domestic and public responsibilities, but his brief references to the notion of "holding the world(s)/people(s) together" or "the general welfare" (*loka-saṃgraham*) are worth looking at. The expression occurs in *Gītā* 3:20, where Viśvanātha briefly glosses it as, "You should do work to uphold teaching, (i.e., good example) in the world" (*loke śikṣā-grahaṇārtham*). In his one line of comment upon *Gītā* 3:25, where the expression appears again, he fails to mention it. In another document of his, a commentary upon the *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhuḥ* of Rūpa, Viśvanātha quotes *Gītā* 3:20 precisely because of the idea of "holding the world together." In that context Rūpa quotes the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* 3:33:6 (*yannāmadheya- . . .*) to sustain his contention that devotion is able to efface the effects of sins that have already begun to bear fruit (*prārabdha*), i.e., have caused a person's current birth in a defiled tribe or caste. The verse says that even an eater of dogs, i.e., a Caṇḍāla, is fit for the oblations of Vedic sacrifice (*savanāya*) if he has taken the name of God. Viśvanātha and the other commentators, Jīva and Mukunda, agree that in practice Vaiṣṇava Caṇḍālas do not participate in Vedic sacrifices, but they differ in explaining the discrepancy between bold principle and cautious practice.[8]

Viśvanātha answers the objector's query of why the Caṇḍāla fails to sacrifice if he is qualified by asserting that since he is a pure devotee such a person has no trust (*śraddhā*) in work. Hence he does not perform it. On the other hand, he points out, it is true that

[8] Rūpa Gosvāmin, *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhuḥ*, ed. Haridās Dās, 2nd ed. (Navadvīpa: Haribol Kuṭī, G.A. 475 or A.D. 1961), 1:1:21-22.

householders of good families (who also are pure Vaiṣṇavas) perform such work for the sake of holding the world together though they too lack trust in it. Here he quotes *Gītā* 3:20. He then adds that the Caṇḍāla Vaiṣṇava is further deterred from performing work for which he is qualified by fear of censure from persons not acquainted with devotional scriptures. Unfortunately for our purposes, but quite understandable in view of the context into which the proof texts from the *Bhāgavata* and the *Gītā* have been drawn, there is no precise delineation of what Viśvanātha means by "holding the world together" (*loka-saṃgraham*). Could it embrace a sense of public responsibility in a world not governed on the pattern of *varṇāśrama-dharma*? Do actions other than Vedic rituals contribute to holding the world together? Were there no scoffers to censure them, would Vaiṣṇava Caṇḍālas perform and Vaiṣṇava brahmans discard Vedic rites? Does *loka-saṃgraham* suggest merely negative avoidance of discord or a more positive commitment to physical and social well-being? Viśvanātha does not say.

What he does say about work seems to exclude two extreme positions: that *varṇāśrama-dharma* is wrong in itself and must be opposed; and, that *varṇāśrama-dharma* is in any way necessary to the ultimate religious quest, devotion to Kṛṣṇa. Between these extremes there seems to be an open field for personally idiosyncratic resolutions of the tension between devotion to Kṛṣṇa and everything else in the world. The crucial factor, according to Viśvanātha, is trust (*śraddhā*). If a person is performing work with his trust anywhere but exclusively in devotion to Kṛṣṇa, then, according to *Gītā* 3:26, one should not create conflict in conscience for him, should not try to undermine his confidence in what he is doing (so long as there is a vein of trust in devotion running through his trust in knowledge, work, etc.). But once he trusts devotion alone, it is a different matter:

> Knowledge depends upon purity of the mind and this purity depends upon performing work without desire. Devotion, however, depends upon its own efficacy and is not dependent upon anything, not even upon purity of mind. If one should be able to arouse trust (*śraddhā*) in devotion, then (one should create) conflicts in conscience (*buddhi-bhedam*) on the part of those who perform work, because there is no eligibility for work on the part of those who trust in devotion. (Comment on *Gītā* 3:26)

Performance of work even without desire may serve some extrinsic purpose, but neither it nor knowledge is integral to the fundamental religious goal, devotion to Kṛṣṇa.

Like most Sanskrit texts composed by Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas, the *Sārārtha-varṣiṇī* practically ignores contemporary history and the relationship between devotion and worldly responsibility. It would be unwarranted, however, to assume from this silence a fundamental Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇava denial of value to living in history, although the prior renunciation of family and world by most of the authors of these Sanskrit texts indicates that those individuals were inclined personally in such a direction. Viśvanātha's commentary leaves open a wide range of ways of coping with the tensions between the historical and the eternal, the world and Kṛṣṇa. I am inclined to view this reticent stance of Viśvanātha and other Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas as symptomatic of an implicit policy of flexibility and freedom for the individual Vaiṣṇava and for local groups of Vaiṣṇavas in fostering devotion while participating in domestic and public affairs. The Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇava interpretation of the *Bhagavad-gītā*, especially as represented in the most influential Bengali document of the movement, the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* of Kṛṣṇa-dāsa, seems to be open to a fairly modern and secular orientation to the facts of religious plurality and social and technological change. Secular in this context, of course, does not mean anti-clerical or anti-spiritual, but rather viewing a wide range of activity as religiously neutral, free of ascribed ritual forms, fit for being performed alongside persons of different communal background and different piety. To gain a more concrete picture of Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇava participation in public affairs under a Muslim-dominated regime we may turn to the biographies of Caitanya, most of which are written in Bengali.

III. *Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇava Participation in the Secular Affairs of Muslim-dominated Bengal*

This section contains an enumeration of Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas contemporary with Caitanya who were involved in the commerce, collection of revenue, administration and personal service of Husain Shāh, his successor and immediate predecessors from the end of the fifteenth century to the middle of the sixteenth. There is some evidence, though less plentiful, of similar involvement of important Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas in the subsequent Mughal administrations of Bengal.

Two brothers of Kāyastha (clerk) caste, Hiraṇya and Govardhana, were in charge of revenue collection at Saptagrām, the leading port on the Hugli River, located a few miles above what is now Calcutta. They had incurred the wrath of a Muslim whom they had supplanted in this lucrative position, but managed to survive his harassment. Both brothers are regarded by Vaiṣṇavas as great devotees and patrons of Vaiṣṇavas and brahmans. Among the persons they patronized were Caitanya himself, his father, Jagannātha Miśra, and his maternal grandfather, Nīlāmbara Cakravartin, who is said to have regarded the two Kāyasthas as brothers (he himself being a brahman). The venerable Advaita Ācārya, whose prayers are said to have prompted Kṛṣṇa to descend as Caitanya, was a special object of their patronage, in recognition of which he introduced Raghunātha-dāsa, Govardhana's son, to Caitanya. The son, unwilling to submit to the worldly demands of householder and revenue collector subsequently ran away to Caitanya, and became an ascetic and poet, one of the noted six Gosvāmins of Vṛndāban. Govardhana sought to win back his son through the good offices of another rich Vaiṣṇava, a Baidya (medical caste) named Śivānanda Sena. Śivānanda was the devotee who organized and financed the annual pilgrimage of Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas from Bengal to Purī in Orissa to see Caitanya and the Jagannātha deity. I have not discovered the source of Śivānanda's wealth, but in view of his origins in Kulinagrām, a town from which a number of Hindus used to go to Gauṛa to serve at the royal court, it is not improbable that he held some royal commission, perhaps as collector of revenue at Kāñcarāpāṛa, the village to which he had moved. Śivānanda was a devotional poet in his own right and his son, Paramānanda Sena, alias Kavikarṇapūra, wrote extensively in Sanskrit on poetics and Vaiṣṇava devotion. His works include a formal poem (*kāvya*) and a drama (*nāṭaka*) on the life of Caitanya.[10]

Nīlāmbara Cakravartin, Caitanya's grandfather, had other good connections. The Muslim inspector (*qāẓī*) whom Caitanya challenged over the right of Vaiṣṇavas to undertake loud devotional processions in Navadvīpa is reported to have claimed the relationship of "village brother" with Nīlāmbara, in view of which he sought to treat Caitanya, then in his early twenties, as his nephew. Nīlāmbara was known also to the royal pundit at Purī, Sarvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, as the fellow student of the latter's father. This network of quasi-brotherly ties is one of several indications that Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas exercised an

[10] CC 2:15:93-97; 2:16: 217-226; 3:6:180ff.; Haridās Dās, *Gauṛīya-vaiṣṇava-itihāsa* (Navadvīpa: Haribol Kuṭi, G.A. 465 or A.D. 1951), I, 199; idem, *Gauṛīya-vaiṣṇava-tīrtha* (Navadvīpa: Haribol Kuṭi, G.A. 465 or A.D. 1951), p. 10.

informal diplomatic function of mediating between the Hindu kingdom of Orissa and the Muslim dominated kingdom of Bengal, or Gauḍa.[11]

Returning to Caitanya we find that his second marriage was to the daughter of a brahman, Sanātana Miśra, a royal pandit (*rāja-paṇḍita*), apparently in the employ of Husain Shāh. Buddhimanta Khān, a landholder or collector of revenue in the vicinity of Navadvīpa, financed the wedding as he had financed devotional festivals for the Vaiṣṇavas in Navadvīpa. This is the Buddhimanta Khān who patronized Ānanda Bhaṭṭa, author of the *Ballāla Carita* (A.D. 1510), a book on social issues stressing the position of Kāyasthas as second to brahmans in a world that is devoid of kshatriyas. The editor of the *Ballāla-carita*, Haraprasād Śāstrī, considers the little book to be part of an agitation arising from Nityānanda's (Caitanya's energetic and unconventional disciple) efforts at "encorporating the wealthy but presecuted Suvarṇavaniks (goldsmiths) into the new and rising Vaiṣṇava community." [12] Many of the leading Vaiṣṇava brahmans in and near Navadvīpa at the time of Caitanya were newcomers who seem to have made common cause with members of other castes seeking greater prestige and influence. In the process they ran afoul of older inhabitants of the area, especially Śākta brahmans accustomed to offering bloody sacrifices. Those depicted in the biographies of Caitanya as most hostile to the Vaiṣṇavas usually are not Muslims, but Śākta brahmans.

Nityānanda's marriage late in life suggests the influence of certain lay Vaiṣṇavas. That Nityānanda, who had been a celibate mendicant should have married two girls in his old age is surprising, and a scandal in some quarters. His father-in-law, Sūrya-dāsa, who is widely hailed as a devotee and who may have authored some devotional lyrics, was mortally afraid over his failure to marry off his daughters. The reasons for his failure are not given. Possibly his contacts with the Muslims had incurred for him some ritual pollution. Here again there was a wealthy zamindar in the background ready to finance the celebration, one Kṛṣṇa-dāsa, son of Hari Hoṛa, a zamindar of Baṛagāchi, north of Navadvīpa. Both are remembered as devotees. Another zamindar associated with Nityānanda's family is the pious Kamalākānta Piplāi, paternal grandfather of Nityānanda's daughter-in-law. Hari-dās Dās reports that the grandson of Kamalākānta, one Rājīvalocana, received a grant of land from the Mughal governor at Dacca. Such a seventeenth century transaction seems to be anachronistic, but is barely possible. A greater strain on the historian's credulity is placed by the story that Nityānanda's son, Vīrabhadra, received from the Muslim ruler a black stone that wept miraculously, from which stone were made several images of Kṛṣṇa. Less fanciful evidence of the good favor of the Nityānanda family with the Muslim rulers is an extant document guaranteeing the family's possession of lands north of Calcutta.[13]

A disciple of Caitanya especially noted for combining loving devotion with the external trappings of wealth and pomp is Puṇḍarīka Vidyānidhi, a brahman with residences in Navadvīpa and near Chittagong. Caitanya assigned to him for training in loving devotion Gadādhara, a young man who became so sensitive to the moods of Rādhā that some Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas believe him to be an incarnation of Rādhā herself.[14] Two brothers who, like Vidyānidhi, combined loving devotion and wealth, Sanātana and Rūpa, came from a family of South Indian brahmans who had migrated to Bengal in the latter part of the fifteenth century. The family had a seat at Rāmakeli, near the capital of Gauḍa, and extensive holdings of land in East Bengal. Sanātana and Rūpa were for a time chief minister (or departmental head) (*sarakāra mallika*) and private secretary for Husain Shāh. They and their nephew, Jīva, are among the most prolific of the six Gosvāmins of Vṛndāban. The brothers resigned from Husain's service on the occasion of a campaign against Orissa, in protest against attacking brahmans, devotees and deities in that Hindu kingdom.[15]

Other Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas employed at the court in Gauḍa include: Mukundadāsa, a Baidya from Śrīkhaṇḍa, friend of Caitanya, and

[11] *CC* 1:17:148-149; 2:6:52-53.

[12] Vṛndāvana-dāsa, *Caitanya-bhāgavata*, 1:15:40-72; *Ballāla-carita* (Calcutta: Hare Press, S.A. 1823 or A.D. 1901), p. vii.

[13] Comment of the editor upon *CC* 1:11:25; Kśirod-bihāri Gosvāmin, *Śrīmannityānanda vaṃśavalli* (Calcutta: Kśirod-bihāri Gosvāmin, B.A. 1337 or 1930), pp. 158-60, 163; Nityānanda-dāsa, *Prema-vilāsa*, ed. Yaśodā Lāl Tālukdār (Calcutta: Patrika Press, B.A.1320 or A.D. 1913), pp. 250-51; Haridās Dās, *Gauṛīya-vaiṣṇavajīvana*, I, 15-17, 228. The Bhāgavatācārya Pāṭha-bāṛi north of Calcutta holds the document guaranteeing lands to the family of Nityānanda.

[14] Vṛndāvana-dāsa, *Caitanya-bhāgavata* 2:7 passim; Nityānanda-dāsa, *Prema-vilāsa*, pp. 216-17; Kavikarṇapūra, *Gauraganoddeśa-dīpikā*, 4th Murshidabad ed. (Berhampur: Rādhā-ramana Press, B.A. 1329 or A.D. 1922), v. 147.

[15] Narahari Cakravartin, *Bhakti-ratnākara*, ed. Nanda Lāl Vidyā-sāgar (Calcutta: Gauṛīya Mission, 1960), I, 526-851; *CC* 2:19 passim.

private physician to Husain Shāh;[16] Dāmodara Sena, alias Yaśorāja Khān, author of *Krishna-maṅgala*, "an officer of the sultan Husain Shāh";[17] Keśava Khān, alias Keśava-chatri, a Kāyastha, writer of devotional lyrics, bodyguard of the king (as were his father and grandfather before him);[18] Gopināth Vasu, a minister (*wazīr*) at court, son of another official, Subuddhi Khān;[19] Subuddhi Rāya, onetime superior of Husain Shāh who rose in power upon Husain's ascension to the throne, only to be chastised reluctantly by the king (at the urging of his queen), after which chastisement he retired to Mathurā to pray and assist Bengali pilgrims;[20] and Mālādhara Vasu, alias Guṇarāja Khān, author of *Śrī-krishna-vijaya*, a Kāyastha of Kulinagrām, "probably a revenue officer of the sultan Rukn-ud-dīn Barbak Shah."[21] Caitanya appreciated Mālādhara's poem and showered his affection upon Mālādhara's kin, Satyarāja Khān (title received from Rukn-ud-dīn Barbak Shāh) and Rāmānanda Vasu, both noted devotees.[22] The younger brother of the royal physician mentioned above (Mukundadāsa) was Narahari Sarakāra, one of the most influential poets and spiritual directors of Caitanya's generation. Though a Baidya from Śrikhaṇḍa, he had a number of brahmans among his disciples, an indication perhaps of his political as well as spiritual prestige.[23]

In Navadvīpa one Subhānanda Rāya, a pious Vaiṣṇava and a man of influence, is said to have been on friendly terms with the king, a predecessor of Husain. His son also was pious and influential, we are told, but his grandsons, Jagannātha and Mādhava, despite their good Vaiṣṇava names, were lecherous drinkers who abused their powers and molested simple people. The conversion of the pair to a pious life of devotion is a famous event in the annals of the Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas.[24] South of Navadvīpa, guarding the border with Orissa, was a Kāyastha named Rāmacandra Khān, remembered as the devotee

[16] Haridās Dās, *Gauṛīya-vaiṣṇava-jīvana*, I, 99-100, 158. Mukunda-dāsa is reported to have fainted once from seeing in Husain a physical resemblance to Kṛṣṇa.

[17] Sukumar Sen, *History of Bengali Literature*, pp. 70, 115.

[18] CC 2:1:171ff.; Vṛndāvana-dāsa, *Caitanya-bhāgavata*, 3:4:48ff.; M. A. Rahim, *Social and Cultural History of Bengal* (Karachi: Pakistan Historical Society, 1963), I, 249.

[19] Haridās Dās, *Gauṛīya-vaiṣṇava-jīvana*, I, 112.

[20] CC 2:25:179ff.

[21] Sukumar Sen, *History of Bengali Literature*, p. 69.

[22] Jadunath Sarkar, *History of Bengal, Vol. 2, Muslim Period, 1200-1757* (Dacca: University of Dacca, 1948), p. 136.

[23] Haridās Dās, *Gauṛīya-vaiṣṇava-jīvana*, I, 99.

[24] Nityānanda-dāsa, *Prema-vilāsa*, p. 214.

responsible for securing a safe-conduct for Caitanya en route to Purī during a period of hostility between Gauṛa and Orissa.[25] Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas in general had ample reasons for wanting to see the peace maintained: access to Caitanya and the Jagannātha deity at Purī; economic interests centered upon trade and gathering of revenue; the fundamentally non-violent character of Vaiṣṇava ethics; and, conviction that Caitanya was Kṛṣṇa descended to earth to establish a new age in which loving devotion would prevail over the violence that had marred the past.

In addition to Rāmacandra's mini-truce, the resignation of Rūpa and Sanātana and the quasi-fraternal links between Vaiṣṇavas, other Hindus and certain Muslims, the evidence that Gaudīya Vaiṣṇavas pursued a policy of reconciliation between Orissa and Bengal includes Caitanya's own behavior, though such evidence is quite scanty. It would distort the evidence, I think, to claim that diplomacy was a major concern for Caitanya, however large such a consideration may have played in the minds of some of his lay followers. His decision to settle at Purī, rather than at the more distant Vṛndāban, is said to have been a concession to his mother and devotees, but an indirect result was to expand cultural and commercial ties between Bengal and Orissa. Caitanya avoided contact with the Hindu king of Orissa, Pratāpa Rudra, as he had refused to meet with Husain Shāh near Gauṛa.[26] One alleged meeting with Pratāpa Rudra provides a remarkable glimpse of Caitanya's view of power politics, if indeed the account is genuine. For Bimanbehari Majumdar, editor of the critical edition of the only text containing this episode, the *Caitanya-maṅgala* of Jayānanda, after weighing the evidence for Jayānanda's reliability, concludes simply that it is "extremely difficult" to decide. According to Jayānanda, Caitanya had just arrived in Orissa (A.D. 1510) when Pratāpa Rudra informed him of an anticipated invasion of Bengal:

> The king begged of the divine Caitanya his blessing.
> The Lord heartily ridiculed Pratāpa Rudra:
> "The king of the five Gauṛas is Kāla-yavana.
> See how many lions and tigers there are inside him.
> The Yavana (foreigner, Muslim) will tear up Orissa.
> Jagannātha will depart from Nīlācala (Purī) for some time.
> . . . . . .
> You acquire kingdoms by conquering the Kāñcī region;

[25] Vṛndāvana-dāsa, *Caitanya-bhāgavata*, 3:2:82ff.; Haridās Dās, *Gauṛīya-vaiṣṇava-jīvana*, I, 178-79.

[26] CC 2:2:47ff.; 2:1:221ff.

I see no way of overcoming Gaura."

. . . . . .

Hearing the Lord oppose it (Bengali campaign),
Pratāpa went off to make war upon Vijayānagara.[87]

Even if the account is not a faithful one—and the pragmatism of Caitanya in suggesting conquest of weaker Hindu kingdoms to the south runs against the grain of loving passivism in the image of Caitanya that we usually get—still the survival of the episode in a fairly popular biography of Caitanya suggests that the scene was considered plausible and proper by Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇavas of the time. It is a far cry from Kṛṣṇa's command that Arjuna destroy even his own relatives to preserve *varṇāśrama-dharma* way back in the waning of the Dvāpara Age.

Table I

Verses of the Bhagavad-gītā cited in the Caitanya-bhāgavata

Gītā	*Gauṛīya Maṭha*	*Nāth*	*Gītā*	*Gauṛīya Maṭha*	*Nāth*
3:21	1:3:25	4	7:16	2:24:89	29
	2:17:178	10			
			9:11	2:25:38	7
3:24	1:3:24	3			
			9:27	2:8:60	5
4:7	1:3:22	—			
			10:8	2:24:183	68
4:8	1:3:23	2			
			10:10	1:1:49	20
4:11	1:4:20	2		2:24:167	59
	1:4:178	28		2:24:186	70
5:18	3:4:177	7	10:41-42	2:20:373-74	61-62
6:3-4	2:24:153-54	53-54	11:41	2:19:199	28
6:8	3:4:178	8	11:42	2:19:—	29
6:16-17	3:8:65-66	4-5	12:13-20	2:23:100-07	50-57
7:4	2:6:164	—	16:19	2:25:39	8
7:5	1:7:118	6	18:54	2:8:65	8
	2:6:165	12		2:24:127	41
	2:20:116	10		2:25:148	43
7:14	2:20:121	12	18:64-65	2:22:57-58	23-24
	2:22:23	7			
	2:24:133	45	18:66	2:9:265	22
				2:22:91	—
				2:8:63	7

Book, chapter, and verse numbers are given in full for the Gauṛīya Maṭha edition of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*. Rādhā Govinda Nāth numbers Sanskrit verses independently within each chapter; his chapter and book numbering coincides with that of the Gauṛīya Maṭha.

[87] Jayānanda, *Caitanya-maṅgala*, ed. Bimanbehari Majumdar and Sukhamay Mukhopadhyay (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1971), pp. xxxiii, 218.